

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE LITIGATION

No. 3:12-cv-06003-CRB

**ORDER RE FINAL APPROVAL AND
PENDING MOTIONS**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

ALL ACTIONS

_____ /

On July 24, 2015, the Court heard all interested parties regarding a motion for final approval of the Third Amended Settlement (the “Settlement”) in this matter after carefully considering all objections, motions, and other filings in conjunction therewith. For the reasons detailed on the record in open court and needing no elaboration in a further written order, the Court determined that the objections were without merit because the value of the governance reforms is commensurate with the challenges apparent in Plaintiffs’ claims, that the scope of the releases has been appropriately narrowed, and that the Settlement represents a fair and reasonable resolution of the claims in this litigation. Accordingly, the Court GRANTED final approval. In light of that ruling, the Court dispenses of pending motions on the docket as follows.

The following motions are DENIED AS MOOT:

- Docket 308, Sushovan Hussain’s Motion to Intervene, is DENIED AS MOOT on agreement of the parties in light of the this Court’s subsequent rulings regarding the bar order.

1 The following motions are DENIED:


- 2 • Docket 352, Objector A.J. Copeland's Motion for Relief from Non-Dispositive Pretrial Order
3 of Magistrate Judge, is DENIED. For the reasons stated in Magistrate Judge Laporte's Order
4 on this matter (dkt. 348), the Court finds that Copeland was granted access to all the
5 discovery to which he was entitled in order to present thorough and substantiated objections
6 to the Settlement before this Court.
- 7 • Docket 358, Plaintiff Harriet Steinberg and Edward Vogel's Motion for Relief from Non-
8 Dispositive Pretrial Order of Magistrate Judge, is DENIED. For the reasons stated in
9 Magistrate Judge Laporte's Order granting in part and denying in part the aforementioned
10 Plaintiffs' request for discovery (dkt. 354), the Court finds that HP was not obligated to
11 produce the specific materials at issue because they were not relevant to the fairness of the
12 settlement.
- 13 • Docket 370, Objector A.J. Copeland's Motion for Relief from Non-Dispositive Pretrial Order
14 of Magistrate Judge, is DENIED. For the reasons stated in Magistrate Judge Laporte's Order
15 on this matter (dkt. 364), the Court finds that Copeland was granted access to all the
16 discovery to which he was entitled in order to present thorough and substantiated objections
17 to the Settlement before this Court.

18 The following motions are GRANTED:

- 19 • Docket 386, Objector Harriet Steinberg's Administrative Motion to Modify Page Limits on
20 her Objection to the proposed settlement, is hereby GRANTED for good cause.
- 21 • Docket 394, HP's Administrative Motion to Modify Page Limits on its Response to
22 Objections, is hereby GRANTED for good cause.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24
25 Dated: July 30, 2015



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE